App. F. IX-4

Previous References

Mag II - 18 1-9

1934.
(Mazrai)

File No. 130 -34
Serial Nos. 1—6

Later References.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 6.

Part B for January 1935

SUBJECT.

Appeal lease of lands belonging Ganga Visveswara devaru at Begavalli Kirthalli Taluk

Do Mr N Bhimacharya Advocate Bangalore City

no 9568 5-1-35

WD 01965—GPB—15,000—7-7-34

Rejects the appeal as there are no reasons to modify the orders of the Mag Court

al against the orders of the M.C.
Re lease of S. Nos 119-120 belonging to Sri
Ganga Viswesvara devaru of Begavalli Tirthahalli Tk.

General and Revenue Secretariat | M43 File No. 13 of 193 4-5 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No.	
1	Petition dy 1.9.34 filed by Mr N. Shivacharya B.A. LL.B Advocate Bangalore City, on behalf of Sri G. Ramakrishnaiya of Ganavalli Tirthahalli Taluk appealing against the orders of the Muzrai Commissioner dy 11.7.1934 agreeing with the findings and recommendation of the Commissioner for the Cancellation of the lease of lands referred to therein belonging to Sri Ganga Viswesvara devaru of Begavalli Tirthahalli Taluk given in the appeal petition Petition filed by the same advocate on behalf of Sri G. Ramakrishnaiya of Ganavalli Tirthahalli Taluk praying for a stay of the orders passed by the Muzrai Commissioner for reasons set forth therein 1. The appeal petition stamped and the appeal It is for orders if it may be and records called for As regards the stay of the orders of the M.C. Sri the D.C. Shivacharya recommended the Cancellation and grant in question after a perusal of the lands & the loan etc

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01955—GPB—22,500—12-6 34

2) re: appl/re lease of lands of Sri Ganga Visweswara devaru

Mrs 3 File No. 13 of 1934 | General and Secre

It is required an appeal is now before Court and stay order Sugar Commissioners How far the request is tenable is a matter to be determined only on receipt of records

2) for order —

5/9 a m

1. The records may be called for.
2. The stay order ~~prayed for~~ may be granted in the event explained.

5/9/34

II Member)

Yes

2. No stay order need be granted

17866/6

J
5/9

7) RR 7/9/34.

8/9

Memo of forwarded put up under P.U.D. is for kind Signature —

from 6 pages,

a DM is put up. Encls

10) 8/9

3

petition sent to M.C. Wide no 3280 10-8-34

Serial No.	
4	No 327 dt 10.9.1934 to Sri N. Bhimacharya Advocate. Bangalore city declining the grant of his request for a stay order in the case referred to therein.
5	H.C 27/34-35 dt 2.11.34 from the Mysore Commissioner forwarding records connected with the appeal and stating that the facts of the case are as in the Deputy Commissioner's letter dt 5.6.34 and his office order dt 11.7.34.
XC	
XP	
	(1) The appellant has given the lease of lands in question for 10 years on a rental of 500 Rs/- p.a under the rules of the M.C.
XN	(Vide No D, Dis 180/28-29 dt 6.2.29) This was done in consideration of the appellant having taken some trouble in bringing the lands under cultivation. Accordingly a lease deed has been executed by the appellant (Haq Z). To ensure payment of rent by him, he
L	has given sufficient security viz. some of the landed property owned by him. The terms of the lease as embodied in the deed are as follows:—
	i) that the lessee would effect timely improvements and repairs
	ii) that in the event of his failure to

NOTE—Contn, Sheet.

WD 01955—GPB—22,500—12-6 34

the rental before the close of Feb[y] every year & obtain the receipts, necessary steps may be taken against him to recover the month.

III & That if he would allow the lands to deteriorate, he is bound to pay the cost necessary for improving the lands & abide by the order given without waiting for the expiry of the lease period.

This is not correct E P 7/12/34

(2) On 5.6.1934 the D.C. Shimoga recommended the cancellation of the lease given to the appellant for reasons set forth in para 4 of the aforesaid letter & this was approved by the M.C. in his order of 10.7.1934 - x P

The D.C. in para 3 of his letter says that he inspected the lands on 3/5/34 with Village officials & the appellant & found the garden & wet lands in a neglected condition. Note of his inspection is not found among the records received. It is also respectfully submitted that the weak points noted in the para are more or less precautionary measures rather than the irregularities sufficient enough to deprive the appellant of the lease given him.

(3) The records received do not

Serial No.

indicate the irregular payments of rental and of the steps taken to secure the same from him excepting a mention of the appellant not having paid the year's amount in time only once - vide the report of the Amildar dt 15.1.30 wherein he says that the lessee is now in arrears for the past period and that he has not yet paid year's amount of the current year.

(4) The present lessee Vir Duggappa Gowda pays the same rental as the appellant & the inst^n is not much benefitted this way — It is for ques if the H.C. may be asked to send up records relating to the inst^n of 3/5/34 made by the H.C. Shimoga, as the Mahazar of 25/6/33 shows that the lands are may be made to yield better fruits at a cost of Rs 1500/—

(5) In para 4 of his pet^n (Flag 7), the appellant says that he has invested nearly 3000/- to Rs 4000/- for improvements & that in the event of his being ejected he would be put to serious loss — whether the tenancy of the lease now to be

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

1/m appl. No 2 of 34-35

File No. of 1934 3 — General and Revenue Secretariat

afford him a cause of action is also a matter which Law Secretary will perhaps have to be consulted for orders —

GS 21/11

17) From a perusal of the records it is seen that in accordance with the agreement executed by the appellant on 31.8.29 (Flag Z), he has agreed to give up the land to Govt, if within the lease period of 10 years, he should allow the land to deteriorate paying the cost of bringing the land to fit condition. From the D.C's report (Flag O) dt 5.8.34 it is seen that, as the lessee Ramalingam Nayagar (appellant in this case) denied the Amildar's report that the land had been neglected, the D.C. himself inspected the lands on 3.5.34 with the Village officials and the appellant and found that the Garden and Wet lands were in a neglected condition. On this report of the D.C. the M.C. has passed the order now appealed against. The petitioner has cleared his case. It is for orders if the case has to be posted for hearing or whether the appeal may be rejected.

7/12/34

18) May be sent to the 2nd Law Member after perusal

7/12

CHIEF SECRETARIAT 7 DEC. 1934

Ch: Secy)

II Member

7/12/34 & 7/12

20) May be rejected

17/12

41 & 13

Mag Appl No 2 of 34-35

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 130 of 1934 — [App. F. 117—

Serial No.	
	Dft. dated 5/11/34 — Date 2/1/35
6	No 956 of 5.1.1935 to Mr N. Bhimacharya Advocate for the appellant intimating that the appeal petition is rejected for reasons stated therein.
	No 957 of 5.1.35 to Mr G. Ramam. Bhimaiya the appellant forwarding for information Copy of the above letter
	No 958 of 5/1/35 to the Magistrate Commissioner forwarding for information Copy of the decision passed ~~by~~ in the Matter.
	B 12.1.35

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 01955—GPB—22,500—12 6 34

File No. of 193 General and Secretariat

GEN'L & REV. SECRETARIAT
262-3
4 - SEP 1934
MYSORE GOVT

TWO RUPEES

Muj 150 34-1.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

BANGALORE.

OFFICE OF THE MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
1 SEPT. 1934
16.49

Revn. Apl. Petn. No. 2 of 1934-35.

*****

Appellant :- G. Ramakrishnaiah, son of Manjaoniya, aged about 44, Smartha Brahmin, Land-holder, Ganavalli Thirthahalli Taluk, Shimoga Dt. c/o Mr. N. Bhimacharya, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Sultanpett, Bangalore City.

1/9/34

Stay order asked for

Versus.

Respondent :- Duggappa Gowda, Land-Holder Kudamallige Village, Thirtha halli Taluk, Shimoga Dt.

3/9/34

****

RE : SURVEY NUMBER 119-120 BELONGING TO SHRI GANGA VISVESWARADEVARU OF - BEGAVALLI, THIRTHAHALLI TQ.

Appeal under Muzarai Regulation

~~Under Section 210 of the Mysore Land Revenue Code.~~ Now used

The appellant abovenamed most humbly begs to state as follows :---

1. That in preferring this appeal against the orders passed by the learned Muzrai Commissioner in No. R. Dis. 76/ 34-35 on 11-7-1934 , whose certified copy is here - with enclosed, the humble appellant begs

begs to set forth the following grounds of appeal among others-

GROUNDS OF APPEAL :-

(1). That the learned Muzrai Commissioner erred in believing that there was deterio - ration of the leased property in the absence of evidence, and notice ~~of~~ (& explanation about) it to the lessee-appellant.

(2). Further the learned Muzrai Commis - -sioner, has failed to take into consideration that this appellant, who as the lessee of these survey numbers for over 25 years, has made the once barren land into a beauti- ful garden, which is going to yield fruits now.

(3). Further the learned Muzrai Commis- -sioner has failed to take into consideration the huge sums invested on this leased pro- perty, in the bonafide belief that the lease would be continued for the full period , even though the Government as the Lessor did not effect the necessary "ಉತ್ತರವು ಸರಿ, ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯು ತಪ್ಪಾಗಿದೆ" as undertaken by them.

(4). That the learned Muzrai Commissioner has failed to notice the allegation that this appellant was not paying the assessment regularly, is not supported either by conduct or facts in that behalf

(5). That the learned Muzrai Commissioner's order of terminating the lease before the - expiry of the period is contrary to law, in as much as there is no notice to quit ,as con - templated under the provisions of law in that behalf.

(6). That even the sale held on 16-2-1934 by the Amildar is illegal, as there was a stay order in that behalf by the learned Deputy Commissioner which was not dissolved., Then.

(7). That the order confirming the sale ~~is~~ in the name of the respondent in preference to Mr. Ananda Rao, who had bid for a higher amount is bad in law.

(8). That the learned Muzrai Commissioner has failed to take into consideration the terms of agreement regarding the lease and his subsequent order in Dis. 492/31-32 and terminat the lease in the absence of any sufficient - reasonsfor the same.

(9). That the appellant enphatically denies the allegations made to terminate the lease., Five years prior to the fixed period in the absence of any enquiry to establish or dis- pute them otherwise.

(10). That the Order of the learned Muzrai Commissioner is contrary to law, facts and equities in the case.

in the case.

(11). That the order of ~~the~~ ejecting the appellant is not sustainable.

(12). Hence the humble appellant prays that the Government of His Highness the Maharaja , may be graciously pleased to call for the records connected with Dis 6/34-35, from the Office of the - learned Muzrai Commissioner for the purpose of considering the correctness, legality and the Propriety of the order appealed against and pass such other order as may be deemed reasonable in the circumstances of the case.

N Bheemacharya
Advocate for Appellant

BANGALORE CITY,
1st Septr. 1934.

Appellant.

I, the appellant abovenamed do hereby solemnly declare and affirm that what is stated above is true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

BANGALORE CITY,
1st Septr. 1934.

Appellant

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER MYSORE BANGALORE
No. M.C. 27/34-35
11 SEP. 1934

TYS

328/M.C.S 10-9-34.

Forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner for submission of records connected with the case. By order

B Muddukrishnappa
M.C.S. for Chief Secretary to Govt.

Mey 130-34-2





BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

BANGALORE.

R. A. NO. of 1934- 35.

*****

Appellant :- G. Ramakrishnaiah
son of Manjappiya
aged about 44,
Smartha Brahmin,
occupation:Land-holder,
Ganavalli,Thirthahalli
Taluk,Shimoga Dt.
c/o.N.Bhimacharya,B.A.LL.B.
Advocate,Sultanpet,B.City.

-:Vs:-

Respondent :- Duggappa Gowda,Land-
holder,Kudamalligе
Village, Thirthahalli
Taluk, Shimoga Dt.

Application for
Stay.

The humble appellant begs to state as follows :---

1. That this appellant was the Lessee of S. Nos. 119-20 situated in Begavalli Village, Thirthahalli taluk and as per express terms of the lease, the appellant is entitled to be in possession as lessee until 1939-40.

(2). That for the reasons of deterioration and irregular payment which are seriously disputed by this appellant, the

the learned Deputy Commissioner of Shimoga in the absence of any notice to quit amd terminate the lease before the period has got these lands auctioned for 30 years lease which is confirmed in the name of the - respondent, ignoring the claim of higher bidders who have deposited the rent.

3. That this appellant is in possession of these survey numbers for over 25 years and has converted the once barren land into the present beautiful garden and had no opportunity till now to reap its benefits.

4. Further the appellant in the bona-fide belief that the lease would be continued till 1939-40 has invested nearly Rs 3,000/- to Rs 4000/- and in the event of his being ejected now , he will be put to a serious loss.

5. That the appellant has preferred the appeal this day against the order of his ejectment, that pending the disposal of the appeal, the appellant prays that orders staying the ejectment may be passed, as otherwise , the appellant would be put to a severe loss which will not be recovered in the event , his appeal is allowed.

6. Further there are still standing crops on the land, for which the appellant is duly entitled as lessee for this year.

(7). That as the land in dispute is in respect of a garden, it is very -- likely that in the event, he is now ejected, and subsequently he is ordered to be put in possession, severe loss may result at the instance of the respondent as the property in dispute is liable for distruction in a short time, and the discontented party i.e., the respondent may not hesitate to do so.

(8). Hence in view of the serious loss, which may be caused and which will be irreparable and the balance of - convenience and equities may better be served by keeping the property in Status quo, rather than by any kind of interference it is prayed that immediate orders staying ejectment may be passed.

Dated at Bangalore City, this the First Day of September, One thousand nine hundred and thirty four.

N B Neewaely
Advocate for Appellant

Advocate for the Appellant.

Appellant.



15

ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE AT BANGALORE.

ಸನ್ 193 —193 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ನಂಬರು
R.A.No. of 34-35.

(ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ) ವಾದಿ (ಅಪ್ಪೆಲೆಂಟು) (ಎದುರಿಜಿದಾರ) ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ (ರೆಸ್ಪಾಂದಂಟು)

Appellant :-

G.Ramakrishnaiah

Vs.

Duggappa Gowda.

To N.Bhimacharya, Esq, B.A., LL.B., Advocate, Sultanpet Bangalore city.
~~ಶ್ರೀಯುತರಾದ~~ ವಂಗಡ/ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್/ಅಡ್ವೊಕೇಟರ್/ಇವರಿಗೆ/ಸಮಸ್ತರಿಗೂ/ತಿಳಿಯಬೇಕಾದದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ

the appellant ಒಕ್ಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮೆ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ರಾವು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ವಿವಾದಿಸಿ ಫೈಸಲಾ ಹೊಂದತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಜಾರೀಕ್ಕೂ ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೂ ದಸ್ತೈಜೇಜು ಪಗೈರೆ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ರಶೀದಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ವಾಪಸಾಗತಕ್ಕ ದಾವಾ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು, ಪ್ರೋಸೆಸ್ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಪಣ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಛತ್ರ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಇತರ ಏಧನಾದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳು ತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಸದರ ತೆಪೆಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವೇ ಆಗಲಿ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಇನ್ನಾವ್ಯಾಸ ಲಾಯರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ನನಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಎಂದು ಏನು ನೆನೆವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಲು ಇದರಿಂದ ಒದ್ದನಾಗಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ತಾ॥ 8/-1-9- 1934. ರುಜು

Appellant.

Accepted

N Bheemacharya

Advocate for appellant

ಈ ಸೂಚ್ಯಾಧಾನವೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥರು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ಇವರಿಗೆ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

(ಸಹಿ) ಅಧವಾ ಶ್ರೀಮಂಗಳ ರುಜು)

Enclosures

1) Appeal petition

2) Stay application

3) Vakalat.

4) Order of the Rent Commissioner

N. Bheemacharya B.A., LL.B

Advocate

for Appellant

Order of the Inam Commissioner in Mysore

16

Reference:-

This Office order No D, Dis 180/28-29 dy 6.2.1934 Sanctioning the continuance of the lease of S. No 119 & S.No. 120 belonging to the Sri Gangavisweswara devaru temple at Bagavalli Thirthahalli Taluk, in favour of Ramakrishniah for a further period of 10 years from 1929-30 on an annual rental of Rs 500/-

2. Letter No Inm I.C. 1117/33-34 dy 5.6.1934 from the Deputy Commr Shimoga District recommending that the lease granted to Sri. Ramakrishniah may be terminated and the same Sanctioned to one Durgappa Gowda for a period of 30 years.

Order No A Dis 6/34-35 dy 11.7.1934

It is reported that as the present lessee Ramakrishniah had Contrary to the terms of the lease deed allowed the lands to dimunicate besides being

irregular in the payment of
the lands were sold on 6-11-1933
Durgappa Gowda stood the hi
for Rs 660/- But as a higher bid of Rs
was subsequently offered by one
Rao, a resale was held on 16-2-1934 wi
Rs 450/- as the initial bid and the
bid in the second sale stood in the name
of Mr. Javali Ananda Rao for Rs 505/-

2. The Deputy Commissioner who personally inspected the lands on 3-5-1934 recommends that the lease granted to Mr. Rama Krishniah may be cancelled and the same sanctioned in favour of Durgappa Gowda, the second highest bidder for 30 years for an annual rent of Rs 500/-, as Mr. Ananda Rao is a resident of Thirthahalli and does not the lands himself.

3. The deputy Commissioner's recommendations are approved Muchalika in the prescribed form Should be got executed at the cost of the lessee, one year's rent being in advance.

The refund of the amount 4 8
viz Rs 5037- deposited by Mr Javali
Ananda Rao is also sanctioned.

S/d N. Madhava Rao.
Inspn Commissioner

Copy applied for by Mr. Ramakrishniah on 30.8.34
Copy ready on 30.8.34
" delivered on 30.8.34
No. of words. 260
Copying fees 0-6-0
Comparing fees 0-1-6
0-7-6

Copied by H Rama Rao.
Compared by S Jagannadha Rao
" Copy "
A Rameshwara Reddi
Manager
Mines Comm's Office



GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNES

General and Revenue Secretariat

Bangalore, Dated, 10th ~~September~~ '34

No. 327 Mag

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

Mr. N.Bhimacharya, B.A., LL.B.,
Advocate, Sultanpet,
Bangalore City.

~~Sir~~

Dear Sir,

With reference to petition dated 1st September 1934 filed by you on behalf of Mr.G.Ramakrishnaiya,Landholder,Ganavalli Tirthahalli Taluk praying for a stay of the orders passed by the Lazrai Commissioner in the matter of leasing out Survey Nos.119 and 120 belonging to the temple of Sri Ganga Visweswara Devaru at Bagavalli,Thirthahalli Taluk, I am directed to inform you that your request cannot be complied with.

Yours faithfully,

For Chief Secretary to Govt.

mk.2

1]

T .....

.....

.....

2 Cdl.co.

Diary No. of letter replied to 2621263

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Date of issue 10/9/34

Signed by Mudaliar Krishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by.....

Section 1143

File No.

Serial No.

No. 327

To

Sri N. Bhimacharya, B.A.,
Advocate, Subramanya
Bangalore City

Dear Sir,

With reference to your letter dated 1.9.34 addressed to you on behalf of Sri G. Ramachar Lambodar Ganavalli Tirthadar of the Tk in the matter of the orders passed by the D.C. in the matter of leasing out S. Nos 119 and 120 Gezonfield, Tirthadar of Sri Ganga Vishnu Devasthanam at Bagalkote, Tirthadar Tk I am directed to inform you that your request for the grant of the said lands cannot be acceded to.

Yours faithfully

WD 01956—GPB—22,500—12-6-34.

(C.13.)
No. Mc.27 Eve 3 file
34-35

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE,

Dated, Bangalore 1st November 1934.

2

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT 505 5 NOV 1934 MUZRAI BR.

FROM

N. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Rajasevasakta
R. Ranga Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief *Secretary to the Government of His Highness*
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

SIR,

Appeal - Ramakrishnaiya - Lease sale of S.Nos.119 and 12 belonging to Sri Ganga Visweswaradevaru of Begavalli, Tirthahalli Taluk.

With reference to your Memo No.328/Muz. dated 10-9-1934 calling for the records on the above subject, I have the honor to forward herewith the entire records received with the Shimoga Deputy Commissioner's letter No.Muz.1.C.617/34-35 dated 23-10-1934 (copy enclosed) together with this office files No.R.Dis.6/34-35 and No. D1 Dis.180/28-29, and to state that the facts of the case are explained in the Deputy Commissioner's letter dated 5-6-1934 and this office order dated 11-7-1934 contained in this office file No.R.Dis.6/34-35.

The appeal petition is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

N. Madhava Rao
Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No.Muz.1.C.617/34-35 dated 23-10-34 from the Deputy Commissioner, Shimoga District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

I have the honor to forward herewith the records relating to the lease sale of S.Nos.119 and 120 belonging to Sri Ganga Visveswaradevaru of Beguvalli Tirthahalli Taluk, as called for in your official Memo No.H.C.27/34-35 date(18/20-9-34.

The facts of the case have been set forth in this office letter No.Muz.C. 1117/33-34 dated 5-6-1934.

The petition received with your official Memo is returned herewith.

"COPY"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 956
Mes 130-34-6

General and Revenue Secretariat,

Dated, Bangalore, 3rd January *193* 5.
5-a

FROM Rajasevasakta
R. Ranga Rao, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Chief *Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.*

To

Mr. N. Bhimacharya, B.A., LL.B.,
Advocate, Bangalore City.

Sir
Dear Sir,

With reference to petition dated 1st September 1934 filed by you on behalf of one Mr.G.Ramakrishnaiya, son of Manjappaiyya, Land-holder Ganavalli, Tirthahalli Taluk, appealing against the order of the Inzrai Commissioner in the matter of the lease of S.Nos.119 and 120 belonging to Sri Ganyavinveswaradevaru at Ganavalli, Tirthahalli Taluk, I am directed to inform you that Government see no reason to modify the orders of the Inzrai Commissioner in the matter. The petition is therefore rejected.

Yours faithfully,

Sd. R.Ranga Rao,
Chief Secretary to Government.

Memo No. 957 & 5-1-35

Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr.G.Ramakrishnaiya, son of Manjappaiya, Land-holder, Ganavalli, Tirthahalli Taluk for information.

By Order,
Sd. R. Ranga Rao,
Chief Secretary to Government.

Memo No. 958/Lr 1738/35 5-1-35

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Inzrai Commissioner in Mysore for information with the intimation that the records received with his letter No.H.C.27/34-35 dated 2-11-1934 are returned herewith.

By Order,

For Chief Secretary to Government.

TSS.

Section Miz.
File No. 130-34
Serial No. 6

Diary No. of letter replied to 505

No. 956

To

Mr N. Bhimacharya BA LLB
Advocate. Bangalore

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

Dear Sir,

Date of issue 5/1/35

With reference to petition dated 1934 filed by you on behalf of one Mr. G. Ramakrishnaiya Son of Manjappaiya, Landholder Ganavalli Tirthahalli Tk appealing against the order of the M.C. in the matter of the lease of S. Nos 119 and 120 belonging to Sri Gangavishwesvara devaru at Bagavalli, Tirthahalli Tk, I am directed to inform

Signed by K B Muddukrishnappa

List of enclosures .....

Copied by .....

Examined by .....

WD 01956—GPB—22,500—12-6-34

25

you that Govt see no reason
to modify the order of the M.C.
in the matter. ~~and~~ The pet^n
is therefore rejected —

Yours faithfully

2/1/35

for Chief Sec

957 of 5-1-35 —
Copy to Mr. G. Ramakrishnaiya
Son of Manjappaiya, Land holder
Gauravalli Taluk Tirthahalli TK.
for information.

B. O

2/1/35

958 Encl 3 files from ~~for~~ Chief Sec ~~not~~ rec
Copy of 5-1-35 W.C. for info with the withdrawal
Copy of M.C. ~~Returning~~ records

~~Perused both~~ the letter no HC
of 2. 11. 1934 are returned herewith.

B. O.

2/1/35

for Chief Sec

G S
2. 1. 35